

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/866,805	Applicant(s) HONMA ET AL.	
	Examiner Vitali Korobov	Art Unit 2155	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Vitali Korobov. (3) Bogdan Zinchenko, Patent Agent.
 (2) Saleh Najjar, SPE. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 07 April 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 16 and 17.

Identification of prior art discussed: Rowe, Weideman ^{P/N} 5819301 and P/N 6,775,519

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed amendments to claim 1 to include applicant's specification description with reference to figure 2 B dealing with content of information to differentiate between summary data and content information. The second remark made by the applicant is that the Rowe and Wiedman are void of any motivation to combine. The applicant's representative will submit an amendment to overcome the Rowe reference including the arguments/remarks presented above. In response, the Examiner will perform further examination and/or search.